



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,515	11/02/2001	Hiroki Tanaka	Fukuda Case 37	5954

7590

04/23/2003

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C.  
2026 Rambling Road  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1699

EXAMINER

COMBS, JANELL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1742

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/003,515		TANAKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Janelle Combs-Morillo		1742	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Restriction*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-2, drawn to aluminum alloy, classified in class 420, subclass 532.
  - II. Claims 3-4, drawn to process of working and heat treating an aluminum alloy, classified in class 148, subclass 694.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by a materially different process such as extrusion or forging.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. During a telephone conversation with Terrence Chapman on April 7, 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1 and 2.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 3 and 4 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

Art Unit: 1742

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghosh (US 4,721,537 A) in view of "Materials Science and Engineering: An Introduction", 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Callister, pp 76-66, (hereinafter Callister).

Ghosh teaches an aluminum alloy example consisting of (in weight%): 5.8% Zn, 2.3% Mg, 1.5% Cu, 0.2% Zr, balance Al (Ex. 5, see column 4), which falls within the instant composition ranges. Ghosh teaches said alloy is typically in the form of heavy sections such as plate, bar, and forging stock (column 1 lines 29-31). Ghosh teaches that hot working said Al-Zn dispersoid (Zr) containing alloy at temperatures within the range of 220-400°C (column 2 lines 60-61, column 6 line 12) achieves dynamic recovery (column 2 line 25), and achieves a very fine grain size (column 2 line 32), such as 2.5  $\mu\text{m}$  for Ex. 5. During dynamic recovery, as the subgrain size decreases, the subgrain misorientation increases (column 2 line 31).

Ghosh does not specify that said alloy contains  $\geq 25\%$  of grain boundaries with misorientations of 3-10°.

Ghosh mentions “subgrain misorientation” (column 2 line 30), which Callister teaches is equivalent to “small-angle grain boundary misorientation” (Callister p 77), which is expected to be on the order of “a few degrees” (Callister p 77).

Because Ghosh teaches an alloy composition within the presently claimed ranges, and wherein said alloy is hot worked at low temperatures (substantially similar to the instant hot rolling temperatures given in the present specification), then substantially the same results, such as %grains with “small-angle grain boundary misorientation” (defined by Callister to be on the order of a few degrees), is expected to occur. Therefore, it is held that the combination of Ghosh (who teaches the instant alloy composition) along with Callister (who teaches the definitions of “small-angle grain boundary misorientation” and “subgrains”) has created a prima facie case of obviousness of the presently claimed invention.

Concerning dependent claim 2, Ghosh teaches a very fine grain size (column 2 line 32), such as 2.5  $\mu\text{m}$  for Ex. 5.

### ***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janelle Combs- Morillo whose telephone number is (703) 308-4757. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King, can be reached on (703) 308-1146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310.

Art Unit: 1742

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. Wyszomierski".

GEORGE WYSZOMIERSKI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

jcm 

April 18, 2003